

The Principle.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1860.

NO. 12.

The Principle

Published Weekly, at 319 Pearl Street, two doors above
Hemp Buildings New-York.

WILLIAM GODDELL, Editor.

SARAH WILSON, Proprietor.

Price—One Dollar a year in advance.

Accept business letters, with testimonials, to

MELANCTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent.

PROSPECTUS.

The object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals, temperate reform, the abolition of slavery, and the maintenance of the Christian Church. It is the application of Christian principles to all the relations, domestic, business arrangement, and aims of life—the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—as the work of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible—our standard, the Divine Law—our obligatory obedience: *our plan, the Gospel, our trust, the Divine promise, our passion, the whole armor of God.*

Editors friendly: please copy, or notice.

For "The Principle"

FEDERAL PROTECTION OF PERSONAL LIBERTY.

Mr. Goddell.—Permit me, through your paper, to express the course of argument by which I have assured my mind, that it is the constitutional prerogative and duty of the Federal Government to make personal liberty universal, within its limits.

Every free man and every lover of freedom must acknowledge that slavery is no more than a matter of local appointment. But it is not necessary to go further and deny the right of the State to create any such institutions as interfere with the rights of citizens of the National Government? The leaders of the Republican party acknowledge—carelessly or erroneously—that power resides in the States to maintain the system within their jurisdiction, and over their citizens. This seems to be a confession unwarranted by the Constitution.

1st. Are there any citizens of the United States? Does that government confer upon any of the inhabitants of its territory the rights of citizenship?

This is an important question. It certainly does. In fact, under what government do those live who reside in the Territories and in the District of Columbia? Or, are they not citizens at all? For they are not of the States. One fact is sufficient to prove what we want. The Constitution does recognise that the Federal Government is to confer citizenship, by making peculiar provision for those who shall fill the offices created to take them, and for those who shall help to elect those officers as to whom they shall be, and this, without any reference to what may be the Law or Constitution of the States in which those citizens (thus constituted) may reside. It seems useless to argue that a Government, founded in good faith, as such, is not a Government, and cannot choose its citizens, or maintain their rights.

2d. What are the rights of citizenship thus bestowed? In the fewest words, and enough for our purpose, the right to hold life, liberty, and property unless deprived—by due process of law. That provision is sufficient to protect all who are citizens of this government from the institution of slavery, quite sufficient, for slavery deprives of all, with out the process of law.

3. To whom does the Federal Government afford these immunities? To all, but those specially exempted; for the general purpose of the Constitution is declared to be the preservation and perpetuation of personal liberty.

4th. How are these exceptions, if there are any, to be interpreted? And why is the application of every saving, excepting clause, to be decided? Not by the officers or the Judiciary of the several States. The Supreme Court of the United States was established to procure a uniform interpretation of law. Then, it must decide the first condition of law, before whom it is binding who profits by it. Of course

the Judiciary of the Federal Government decides the question of its own citizenship. To this body all appeals from State Tribunals are made, and it is thus decide all cases of citizenship which are appealed.

5th. If these powers reside in the Federal Judiciary, under the Constitution what possible authority can be possessed by any other organization, to institute such systems as destroy its whole effect? It decides that this man is a citizen of the United States, holding his right to life, liberty, and property under the guarantees of the Constitution—can South Carolina make him a slave in the face of that decision? Such would be a case of war, between nationalities.¹⁷

Statesmen have repeatedly affirmed that they had no ulterior design upon the existence of slavery, simply because, as they conceived Congress has no right to interfere with the peculiar institutions of the States, or to legislate for them. True, it is: and it is true that the States may regulate their domestic institutions, but not establish them against the spirit of the Constitution. The National Government may not interfere with them as institutions, but as institutions affecting men. No power resides in Congress to interfere with the relation of the master to the slave: but we must admit that power resides somewhere to regulate the relation of the citizen to the government, and to assert the rights possessed by each, and the obligations existing between them. Where, but in the Supreme Court, can this power be found? Who doubts that the United States Government may declare the black man to be its citizen? Then no State would treat him as a slave.

Slavery can never be abolished as a matter of legislation, but as an *infraction of the rights of citizens of the United States*, it may become a subject for the consideration of our Executive. This seems to be the just position—the power to abolish slavery at once, and without legislation, belongs to the joint action of the Federal Executive and the Federal Judiciary. For be it remembered, that the abolition of slavery is but the execution of the absolute provisions of the Constitution as they may justly be interpreted by the proper authority.

We read the recent and previous decisions of the Supreme Court, in regard to the condition of the slave, with disgust at their baseness, and treachery to humanity and truth, but never with any question or doubt as to the Constitutional privilege of that body to judge the claims of any person to citizenship. Now, reverse that decision—let it read that the slave is, by no provision or principle of our Law, deprived of those rights of citizenship, which he possesses by virtue of residing within the limits of the Government. Let it read, that the slave—the black man—is a citizen, as it now decides that he is not, and no power on earth—no act of legislation on the part of any one of the several States, can deprive him of those rights of person and property which he holds as the humanities of his citizenship.

With such a decision, it would be infringing upon the just authority of the States to protect him, any more than it would be an injury to the rights of Great Britain, to do the same in her case, under similar circumstances. She has no such rights.—Suppose that the State is sovereign, so is the Federal Government, so is Great Britain. Outrage on the citizens of other States, is as repugnant to our sovereignty, our Government has the right to protect the subject who ever he may be, whether he be Georgian or Saracenic. The fact that Georgia is within the confederacy, gives that State no ground of interference with the claims of the citizens of the Federal Government. In this respect she stands on the same footing with Foreign States, for all States are equal, in such questions alike. And who will deny that any Executive may interfere, and act in behalf of injured subjects abroad? Once establish the fact that the man is a citizen of the United States, and his rights must be asserted and

maintained against all outrage and interference from all independent, as all subordinate Governments. Let those decisions of the Supreme Court be reversed, as they may be, and should be. It becomes the duty of the Executive branch of the Federal Government, to take immediate action in view of it, to interfere decisively in behalf of millions of our citizens, oppressed in certain States as it would if Russia should treat them as slaves.

"State Rights." Suppose, that the several States were to enact laws making it allowable to sell to the highest bidder the members of the different branches of the National Government, who resided within their limits, as soon as they were elected? Yet they have as full Constitutional power to do this, as to make the black man property, or to sell the rightful constituents of those offices.

The power totally to abolish slavery in every State, resides in the Executive and Judiciary of the Federal Government—to do this merely by annulling past, unnatural, untrue, unjust, unconstitutional decisions of the Supreme Court. Slavery may then exist theoretically, as now, But, no citizen of the United States, can be affected by it—no man can be its victim. F. A. W.

[NOTE. We regard the preceding view of our Correspondent a very important one, and well adapted to meet the objections of a large class of persons, who, somehow find a difficulty in admitting that Congress has a right to abolish slavery in the States. Or our own belief is that Congress, as well as the Judiciary and Executive has the power. And whether the action be called abolishing, interfering with State institutions, or with the relation of master and slave—or whether it be called regulating the conditions of citizenship, and protecting the citizens of the National Government—it all comes to the same thing. They cannot be separated, where the condition of slavery is concerned. And if the Judiciary and Executive do not do their duty in the premises, it is, in our judgment, the business of Congress to support the Constitution by appropriate legislation. On another point we might dissent. The Supreme Federal Court, in our view, is not exclusively invested with the prerogative of interpreting law or of establishing uniform interpretations of it. Yet this furnishes no reason why it should not, within its sphere, interpret, nor why the Executive should not enforce. Conflicts of judicial decisions are safeguards of freedom, when freedom is invaded, either by the State or Federal authorities, and this is one of the main benefits of our Federal system. But F. A. W. is decidedly correct in maintaining the just powers of the Federal Courts, and in saying that nothing is wanting but their just exercise, in order to the abolition of slavery. The friends of liberty are not wise, when, in view of its unrighteous decisions, they seek to disparage its constitutional powers.—EDITOR OF PRINCIPLE.]

REV. THE CHURCH, 1860

THE CONSTITUTIONAL OATH

No. II.

Not very long since, at a session of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, Bushnell and Johnston, convicted of a violation of the Fugitive Slave Law, made application for a discharge. The Court, a minority dissenting, refused the application on grounds substantially as follows:

That the Constitution guarantees to the owner of an escaped slave a right of recapture, and that a citizen who interferes for the rescue of such a slave, is guilty of violating the Constitution, violating the Fugitive Slave Law is constitutional, and that the question is not whether the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 is unconstitutional or not, but certain particulars, but whether Congress has any power to pass any law whatever for the reclamation of slaves, that such a power has been acquired in, by all departments both of the Federal and State Governments from an early time,

and that the question of such a power being affirmatively decided by the highest legislative and judicial authority of the Court, cannot be the occasion of a violation of its constitution.

Now, without wishing to remark upon the loose thinking, the recklessness, and historical falseness of the above decision, let us suggest that the fear of God had raised the Court above the fear of man; that it had been duly impressed with the binding obligation of the oath, and with a desire to administer justice; and then see how easily and naturally the Court might have sustained itself, both by the Constitution and by history, in an opinion like the following:

"The constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Law is the first question before this Court. This question must be determined by a direct reference to the Constitution itself. No weight of legislative and judicial authority, no long continued existence of that law, can authorize this Court to adhere to it, if it is unconstitutional. Now, if we examine the Constitution diligently, we find not one word in it about slaves. It secures a right of service. But a right of service and a right of ownership in the servant, are very different things. The latter is not recognized, and of course the former cannot be recognized as resting on the latter. The service, to be secured by the Constitution must be 'due'—either legally or morally. But we cannot owe service, as property, either morally or legally. It is doing violence to language to state that extorted and unrequited service can be due. And this Court cannot put violent constructions on language, for a purpose that would defeat the aim of the Constitution to establish justice and secure the blessings of liberty to the people; nor can it go out of the Constitution into assumed history to find a warrant for the crimes of rendition, as has been done.

"If the Court were disposed to rest the constitutionality of the Fugitive Slave Law on authorities, it could find for that law but slender support. The Act of 1793 was never recognized by any State Government, till 1812, or nineteen years after the Act was passed. No case under the Act came before the Supreme Court of the Union till 1842, when the Act was forty-nine years old. This tardiness excites suspicion but surprise. Is there not ground to apprehend something wrong about the passing of the Act? The thought of delivering up an unfortunate man to the wrogs of slavery is revolting to our sense of justice and feeling of humanity; to deliver up one who runs away from a service that he honestly owes, is quite a different thing. If the Act of 1793 aimed at the reclamation of slaves and not of persons who really owe service, its true intent was not honestly expressed, the sense of the Act for it says nothing about slaves.

Did all the members of Congress who voted for the Act understand its intent? Had the people then learned to understand 'person held to service' as meaning 'slave'? If they had not, then we have an explanation of the otherwise unaccountable fact that no great national sensation attended the passing of the Act like that which its amendment produced in 1850. If the amendment shocked the Union, could the original Act have done less with its unrighteous intent fairly expressed?

"On a question of constitutionality, this court could be satisfied with no authority short of the authority of the people. But how have the people always regarded the Fugitive Slave Law? The fact that the law of 1793 was entirely inoperative for at least twenty years from its passage, that it needed an amendment to give it effect, that the amendment was not ventured on, till fifty-seven years after the law was passed, and that it is even now a general failure, is anything but a sign that the people, who are the sovereigns, ever, by their Constitution, consented to the wrong of surrendering the escaped victims of slavery. Had the popular sentiment of the nation given prompt effect to the Act of 1793, it might have shown that the people felt themselves constitutionally bound to sustain it. But its failure proves the contrary with far greater force, than its absence could have done.

"An incident occurred in 1790, which illustrates the national sentiment at that time. President Washington, who, three years before, had signed the fugitive Act, desired to reclaim a female slave escaped to New Hampshire. In a letter from Philadelphia, dated November 28 to Mr. Whipple, Collector of Portsmouth, requesting that she might be returned, she said: 'I do not mean, however, by this request that such violent measures should be used as would excite a mob or riot, which might be the case if she has adherents;

or feel uneasy sensibility in the minds of well disposed friends.' Mr. Whipple in his reply, dated December 22, engaged to return the woman, if he could do so without the consequences with which Washington visited a mob. But she was never returned, but lived free to old age. Not even in Washington, would the people permit the wrong of rendition. No wonder the Act was a dead letter, and that Washington did choose to try its efficacy.

If the above manner of showing how the constitutional oath should be observed, is deemed singular, it is hoped that the reader will pardon it. The extract from Washington's letter was published from the autograph by Mr. Sumner, in his constitutional argument against slavery, delivered August 26, 1852.

BEECHER ON SLAVERY.

The Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, has recently been having a somewhat interesting discussion in relation to the pro-slavery character of the American Board, and the propriety of continuing their contributions to its support. On Monday evening last, Mr. Beecher, their Pastor, came to the defense of the Board; and in doing so, seems to have changed front altogether on the slavery question. He said, when anti-slavery was unpopular, he defended it; now he would defend the rights of those who were called pro-slavery. This, if it means anything relevant to the question in hand, means that Mr. B. will defend their claim to Christian character and fellowship. This may be chivalrous, but it doesn't sound like Beecher, as we have heard him thunder from Plymouth Pulpit, against slaveholding and pro-slavery sinners under the guise of religious profession.

But the radical fact of Mr. Beecher's position, lies deeper than a mere apology for pro-slavery church members. It is found in his statement, that 'nothing is bad in itself, or good in itself, that there may be unselfish slaveholding, that a man may be in circumstances where he cannot emancipate his slaves, and, therefore, cannot help being a slaveholder.'

Now this would sound well enough from the lips of south side clergymen, such as Mr. Beecher is wont to show up in his congregation in no way to their advantage. But for one like the Pastor of the Plymouth Church, who is accustomed to proclaim the immutable holiness of God, the unchangeableness of His law, the instant duty of sinners to repent and put away their sins, and that there can be no circumstances of external pressure that can act as an absolute bar to such repentance, to utter doctrines so flatly in contradiction to his ordinary preachings, and so plainly at variance with sound ethical philosophy, is a thing to fill one with sadness and amazement.

"Nothing bad in itself—nothing good in itself." This is a comprehensive denial of all abstract principles. God is not good in Himself—The Devil is not bad, in himself. There is no such thing as abstract justice, no such entity as abstract right. All arguments *a priori* are fallacious. It will be no more possible to determine an effect by studying the nature of its cause, for cause can have no quality and force by and of itself for good or evil. Such is the doctrine of Mr. Beecher, stated more in detail: a doctrine that leaves us no principle or law by which to try the quality of things.

How contrary to all this are the teachings of Christ, an expounder of whose doctrines Mr. Beecher claims to be. "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit;" either make the tree good and the fruit good, or else make the tree corrupt and the fruit corrupt. Here the tree is itself good or bad. But Mr. Beecher says nothing is good or bad in itself, it is only good or bad according to its results. But it is manifest that there could be no such thing as good or bad results from anything, legitimately, that was not either good or bad in itself, unless you can have an effect without a cause. The fruits of a thing neither good nor bad in itself, would themselves be utterly without moral quality. So that if the fruits of slavery are bad, it must be because slavery itself is bad. To talk, therefore about unselfish slaveholding, is the same as to talk about unselfish stealing, innocent and honest thieves, for the first act in slaveholding is the supreme robbery.

Then Mr. Beecher speaks of certain cases in which it might be impossible to emancipate a slave. Then there must be cases in which it may be impossible to 'cease to do

evil,' impossible to get away our sin. Now this is absurd so long as there remains evil to man. For if it were set free, free, no power could ever again profit us. If, though the Government might 1844, we though it might refuse to execute the legal papers, if I remember the relation, to use his labor without wages, or to exercise any one of the powers of slavery over him, the Government may become the slaveholder, by declaring him *de facto* a slave, but I certainly cease to be such. And this is the plain and instant duty of every slaveholder in defiance of all authority with pains and penalties to the contrary.

If Mr. Beecher endeavors to stand on the pro-slavery doctrine he has now laid down for himself, he must fail. This is not the time to take a retrograde movement, the onward progress of the cause of freedom and justice must sweep down conservatives and apologists for slavery under any circumstances. The Pastor of Plymouth Church must retreat from the ground he has taken, or the power of his ministry has been eliminated, and this having starved down suddenly from its zenith of glory.

D. PLUMER.

New York January 28, 1860.

Antient Paganism and Modern Slaveholding Christianity.

The reproduction of ancient Paganism under the guise of modern Christianity is a very curious phenomenon. It is presented in that phase of Athenism through which the priests of a slaveholding Democracy are now dragging the religion of our own State and country. The political throne is set above the religious, and the conscience towards God is subject to a first mortgage upon it, held by the State, which is ready to foreclose at any time. We find in the first volume of Noander's Church-History, a very instructive passage, in his account of the causes of the perversion of the early Christians. "Ideas," he says, "of the universal rights of man, of universal religious freedom and liberty of conscience, were altogether foreign to the views of the ancient world. No such idea it will be otherwise, for with them the idea of the State was the highest idea of ethics, the end and realization of the supreme good. Consequently, the development of whatever else is good, or an object of human desire, was made dependent on this. And so even the religious element also was subordinate to the political. They knew of none but State religious and National gods.

Here we are exactly. This State religion is set up as supreme by the apostles of the modern slaveholding Democracy, and they and their organs acknowledge nothing higher, but would put every man's conscience and piety under the bonds of this. The religious element is subordinate to the political, and the theological doctrine of this subordination may be found in the columns of *Observers, Expresses, and Journals of Commerce*, standing in old paths of Pagan antiquity, and interpreting the higher law as a mere insurance for the lower.

"It was Christianity," continues Noander, "that first of all and alone substituted more enlarged views of this narrow principle of antiquity. Instead of National deities, and the paramount obligation of political ties, it taught men to worship the one God of all human beings, and to see in all men alike the common image of that one God, while in the place of the State as the fountain of authority, it substituted a universal kingdom of God, embracing and superior to all human politics. Looked at from this point of view, which was the one actually taken by the ancient world, a defection from the religion of the State could not appear otherwise than as a crime against the State."

Now here we are again exactly. Slaveholding and the sacredness of slave property being the religion of the State, a defection from that religion is a crime against the State. It must be regarded as high treason, and if the laws are not sufficiently explicit in regard to this, they must be made so, and laws must be passed, under which an invasion of the sacredness of slave property may be punished by treason against God and the Federal Government. The Christianity that of old substituted the worship of one God for the worship of mere national deities, now sets up this latter form of the National religion and its political ties as supreme, and makes the worship of the National deity to be the worship of God.

Noander goes on to show that "in the ancient Roman world its exclusive political principle engendered every other interest. Its influence is distinctly recognizable in the Principle which Cicero lays down as a fundamental maxim of legislation. No man shall have any particular good of his own; no man shall worship him publicly any new or foreign gods, unless they have been publicly recognized by law. This feeling suggested the advice of Cicero to Augustus, expressing the prevalent sentiments of the Roman statesmen of that period: 'Worship the gods in all respects according to the laws of your country, and

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY FEBRUARY 4, 1860

Positions of Henry Ward Beecher.

He held that a man might hold a slave and not do wrong. This must be the case until time was annihilated. There might be formalities, and whether they took seconds, days or weeks, time must be consumed. Such a thing as immediate emancipation was impossible. There was nothing bad or good *per se*. A thing was bad if its consequences were bad, and *vice versa*, and all things were to be judged by their tendency to good or bad.

The above is from the speech of Mr. BEECHER, in the discussion following the American Bazaar by the Plymouth Church, Jan. 23, as reported in the N. Y. Times of the next morning. It is the old doctrine of gradualism ever again, and standing in its proper logical connection, with the doctrines. That, "slavery" is not *sin per se* in other words, is not *sin* in itself, and, further 2. with the still more comprehensive doctrine that there is nothing that is *sin per se*, *sin* in itself because all the sinfulness (or criminality) of *sin* lies, not at all in itself, in its own nature, but only in the tendency or consequences of sinning. Or, in commercial parlance, that nothing is sinful, so long as it will pay.

We thank Mr. Beecher for his frankness, and we honor him for his philosophical accuracy, in placing these things together, where they belong, where they can be looked at, and seen, just as they are. Of gradualism we have heard enough all along for thirty years past. So also of the doctrines that slavery is not "*sin per se*," *sin* in itself. Equally familiar have we been, at that time, with the philosophy of utility or expediency, as taught by Hobbes, Hume, Godwin, and Voltaire, as the foundation of virtue, and with equal clearness and success, by Bishop Lab. Arch-deacon Paley, and Rev. Dr. Taylor of New Haven. We were aware, somewhat vaguely perhaps, of the ethical affinity between these several positions. Mr. Beecher has shown us, more clearly, the consecutive relation between them. His argument before an intelligent church, required him to do this. The American Bazaar was to be vindicated. It was only on the ground of gradualism that this could be done. But gradual emancipation, involving a continuance of slavery, was to be justified in no way but by maintaining that slaveholding is not, in itself, sinful. And this in its turn, could be maintained only by taking for its basis, under ground, that no practice is, in itself, sinful (or blame worthy) on its own account, or for what it is in itself, but only on account of the consequences resulting from it. We do not suppose that Mr. Beecher, on this occasion, or for the first time, or for the mere purpose of carrying a point, adopted these several theories. But, having before held them, he knew how to string them together for service, when service was required of them.

Here then are his positions:

1. Gradual emancipation, involving present continuance, in slaveholding; the present existence of slavery. This he advocates in opposition to immediate emancipation.
2. Slavery, or slaveholding, is not bad, in itself.
3. Nothing is bad in itself, but bad only on account of its bad tendencies, results, effects, consequences.

Against each of these we might advance separate arguments. Against the first we might bring the heaven-revealed duty of immediate and unconditional repentance and reformation. "Now is the accepted time." "Excuse judgment in the morning" without delay. We might say, in the use of his own words that failing to insist on this, slavery must continue to exist, and be innocent, until time is annihilated. We might reverse his statement and affirm that all emancipation *except* immediate emancipation is impossible, and has never been witnessed. Against the second proposition we must urge, that if slavery or if slaveholding, be not *sin* in itself, then it is not *sin* of itself, since nothing can be *sin* out of itself, or *sin* in itself, or *sin* in itself.

But, since the first two propositions repose for their support on the third as Mr. Beecher himself evidently understands, we may as well come down to that point and see whether that proposition can stand.

"There is nothing bad or good *per se*. Nothing good or bad in itself, and *vice versa*, all things are to be judged (pronounced good or bad) by their tendency to good or bad.

By the terms "bad or good" in the beginning of the sentence, we suppose Mr. Beecher means wrong or right, innocent or sinful. And by the same terms, near the close of the sentence, we suppose he means the misery or the happiness resulting from wrong or right actions. Otherwise there would be nothing intelligible in his statement. He does not mean to say that all things are to be judged right or wrong according to their tendency to right or wrong—or that all things are to be judged miserable or happy by their tendencies to misery or happiness. Such statements would be mere tautology and verbiage.

The meaning then, is this. There is nothing right or wrong *per se*. All things tending to misery is wrong, and *vice versa*, and all things are to be judged by their tendency to misery or to happiness.

This is equivalent to the proposition that there is no right nor wrong, no holiness nor sin, in the universe. If the moral quality or essence of right or of holiness, does not lie in itself, then it lies nowhere. If the moral quality or essence of wrong, or of sin, does not inhere in itself, then it inheres nowhere. The one cannot inhere in happiness, nor the other in misery. It is confusion of language as well as of ideas, a confounding of moral distinctions as well as of the meaning of words, so to identify sin with suffering, and happiness with virtue, as to deny the distinction between them, and to transfer praise and blame from the one to the other. The heaven established connection between them does not make them one and the same thing, for this would render such connection impossible.

The man who does a mean act is guilty of that mean act, and blame worthy and self condemned on account of it, irrespective of the misery that his mean act is likely to produce. The man who performs a right, a noble act, is virtuous in consequence of it, deserves approbation, and has the approbation of his own conscience, irrespective of the tendency or effects of his action.

Ingratitude, envy, malice, revenge, are in themselves, wrong, sinful, and blame worthy, whatever may be the effects they may produce. And the opposites of these vice are virtues, and are lovely and commendable in their own nature, irrespective of their tendency to produce happiness.

In other words "right and wrong," "holiness and sin," are terms that express existing realities, having distinct characters of their own, deserving complacency or aversion, praise or blame, without stopping to inquire after the consequences flowing out of them. The things themselves, not their consequences merely, draw forth the commendation and sympathy of God and of good men.

God loves the right because it is right; he hates the wrong because it is wrong. From this cause, for this reason, God rewards the right, and punishes the wrong, by connecting happiness with the one, and misery with the other. He does not love the right, because he has appointed for it a reward; neither should we. He does not hate the wrong because he has provided for it a punishment, neither should we.

Every divine threatening of punishment is an expression of God's hatred for a temper or act that is wrong or sinful in itself. Otherwise he would not punish it. For he punishes not, without a good reason. He punishes nothing that is not deserving of punishment. Every divine promise of reward is an expression of God's love of righteousness, virtue, or true holiness; and he loves it for what it is, in itself. Otherwise he would not reward it. His rewards are not without a good reason.

There is, then, a right, and a wrong in the nature of things. And human acts, have, in themselves, a moral quality, irrespective of their consequences. All moral acts are either right or wrong, in themselves, *per se*. Slaveholding is a moral act, as is the act of one moral being toward another moral being. That act is either right or wrong.

It is either right or wrong, or else it is *sin* in itself, right *per se*, or wrong in itself, *per se*. "All unrighteousness is sin." If slaveholding is right, if it is innocent, then it should be commended and protected by law. If wrong, it shall be condemned and forbidden, excluded from the Church as a sin, and suppressed by the State, for the necessary protection of men's dearest and most essential rights.

From all this it is easy to elude the duties of Churches, Ministers, and Missionary Boards. If the American Board has treated slaveholding as sin, in itself, and as being hateful and offensive to God, then it has done right. If other-

wise, then it has done wrong. If the Pilgrim Church in Brooklyn, with its pastor, have regarded and treated the act of slaveholding, or man-stealing (for the terms are synonymous) as God regards and treats it, they have done right. If not, they have done wrong.

PETITIONS FOR A LIBERTY BILL.

From Brooklyn (Eastern District Late Williamsburgh), petitions for a Personal Liberty Bill have been forwarded to the N. Y. Legislature at Albany, estimating about five hundred names. The number might have been indefinitely increased, but for the want of volunteers who could spare the time to carry the petitions from door to door. As most of the active business men, in this District, do business in New York City they could be found at home only on mornings and evenings. A large portion of the names obtained were those of shopkeepers and mechanics.

Nearly half of the names were obtained by two young ladies. With a dozen or two of such laborers, quite a sensation at the Capitol might have been produced. As it is, we are cheered with the discovery of what, with adequate efforts, may be done.—It is found that the numerous German population are generally quite ready to sign. And one of the gentlemen who canvassed his neighborhood, (Green Point) reports that he obtained the signatures of more Democrats than Republicans. He accounts for it by the considerations that Republican politicians, at this juncture, are especially solicitous to get rid of the charges brought against them, of being abolitionists; whereas the Democratic aspirants, relying on the good odor of their party, at Head Quarters, are under less necessity to be over cautious in the matter. And everybody, almost, inwardly abominates the Fugitive Slave bill, and would gladly help fugitives.

PETITIONS FOR SLAVERY IN NEW-YORK!

We learn that petitions are circulating in New York City, asking the State Legislature to re-enact the "Nine Months' Law," by which slaveholders may again be permitted to hold their slaves in this State for nine months. It is well known that under that enactment, slaves were held year after year, by an easy evasion of the act. When the "nine months" were nearly expired, the master would take his slave across the Jersey City ferry, bring him immediately back, and thus renew the term, for nine months longer, and so on, as long as he pleased. The real object of the movement is to establish a precedent and a principle by which New-York may again be made a slave State. The real issue is beginning to be understood. The "irrepressible conflict" is coming on, in good earnest. All the States are to be free States, or all of them are to be slave States. There is to be no middle ground, and politicians might as well be apprized of the fact, and prepared to take their stand, on the one side or the other.

Mr. O'Connor is progressing bravely. Having affirmed the justice and righteousness of "Negro slavery" he finds himself driven to the necessity of defending that position by denying the foundation fact, the constructive principle of negro slavery from which its whole code is derived; the removal of which would be the abolition root and branch, of the entire system, namely, human chattelhood! When Mr. O'Connor gets the assent of his clients to this, he will have terminated the anti-slavery agitation, by transforming the slaveholders to abolitionists. Success to him! The following is from Mr. O'Connor's reply to Evans, on the trial of the "Lebanon Slave case" before the Court of Appeals, at Albany.

"My friend says virtually that nothing is slavery except the *brutal* and *sub-jugation* of man, in the use of the most odious form that is possibly conceived—an ownership, being pure, absolute, and complete. And such indeed is the state of slavery as it has existed in some stages of the world's history—slavery of free born white men to their own countrymen, their own color and class—their natural equals in all things. That pure slavery does indeed carry with it all the consequences of which my friend speaks. The master absolutely owns his slave; he has power over his life; he may torture him, he may slay him, and he is answerable to no one, any more than the patriarch in ancient times was answerable for exercising the same power over the child of his own loins. That slavery, pure and simple, whether applicable to the negro or white man, is bad. But such a kind of slavery as does not exist and never has existed within this Union—such as never did exist within our territory and

never will exit, and is not claimed by any one to be enforced or established. The slavery which exists within this Union is such as to render hardly proper, in strictness of language, the term "enslaved," or the term "property." Neither of these words are applicable to the slave himself, and the phrase that slavery is a mere evil. Indeed, it is wholly false. It is for the purpose of misleading the good men of this guilty multitude, that this phrase was coined by wicked or wicked men. The slavery which does exist in these United States, and which will exist so long as there is the "United States, is a right in the master to the services of the slave or servant; and that is all. This, this abhorred slavery that my learned friend reads about from "Taylor on the Civil Law," under which the slave might be tortured for evidence and might be put to death, all of which might have been executed upon a child by the parent in former times. Is a thing unlawful to our law or in our country? Is it called slavery? Is it called a crime? Is it called a sin? Is it even so viewed in the hustings? Is it a phrase uttered for peaceful purposes and with the most perfidious results.

Every one acquainted with the Slave Codes of the Slave States, knows that they emphatically affirm and, at every step, amplify and enforce what Mr. O'Connor here denounces. Fane, in his *Dred Scott* dictum affirms this condition of the Slave as preferable to chattelism, when any white man can be made to chattelize, when he says he has "no rights which a white man has bound to respect." Such a one could have no right to exemption from Chattelhood, and might with impunity be held and treated as a Chattel.

Dr. Scudder's Lectures on India.

Are a rare treat to those who are favored with an opportunity of hearing them. He is one of the most accomplished Lecturers we have ever heard. Gifted with great fluency and ease of expression, with a perfect knowledge of his subject, in all its vastness and variety, and kindling with enthusiasm in the presentation of it, he carries his hearers along with him, and makes them see, and understand India, in some degree, as he himself, does.

His first lecture was upon the races of India, their language, curious customs: Fakirs, Indian hermits, Hindoo yit, and Hindoo women. His second, was upon the physical peculiarities and beauty of the country. The literature of India, the athletes and jugglers of Hindoostan. In this, he described Hindoo travelling, mode of writing, poetry and singing. His third lecture was upon the Brahmic priesthood. Caste. Description of a visit to a temple covering more than ten acres of ground. The Brahmins are highly cultivated by education, and intellectual. The native Christian preachers exhibit great originality and tact. Some of these are from the lower castes, who, under the Hindoo system, had been excluded from education, but are now competent to grapple with the proud Brahmins, and silence them, in the presence of the people.

Caste, said Dr. Scudder, is, originally and essentially a religious institution, reposing upon the sacred books, for its authority, though protected and enforced by the civil power. This reminded us that the American caste system reposes on perverted interpretations of our Scriptures, and is sanctioned by a corrupted religion, otherwise it could not be maintained by the State. The Soodra like our slaves, are not permitted to read or hear the "Sacred books" of their country, but must learn their duty only from their superiors. They may not intermarry with the higher castes, and can own no property, except dogs. [Our slaves are not even permitted to own them.] The contempt of a Brahmin for a Soodra, knows no bounds, while cows, peacocks and monkeys, are objects of adoration. ["No rights that a white man is bound to respect!"] "Where the love of Christ enters," says Dr. Scudder, "caste goes out." Such is the heatism in India—the counterpart of heatism in America. Speedily may both fall!

Two more lectures remain.

OBITUARY.

Died at Hudson, Ohio, Jan. 25th, EPHRAIM STROCK, Esq., at the 89th year of his age. He was born in Southbury, Conn. Dec. 20, 1771, and graduated at Yale College, 1792. He was, for many years, a merchant at Greensboro, Vt. His hopeful conversion to Christ occurred in 1806, since which time he has been, wherever his abode, intelligently and earnestly devoted to the service of his Lord. He was a Calvinist, in his theology, active and systematic in his benevolence, stated, in his seasons of prayer, both in family and

in private, an example as a parent, in his fidelity to his children, to teach them the way of life. He was the father of six sons and two daughters who grew to maturity, of whom, three sons and both the daughters died in the Lord, before him; while all his surviving children and many of his grand children are the pious disciples of Christ. His last days were truly his best, walked with God, became a martyr's grave in a full communion, like as a shock of corn cometh in his season.—[Communicated.]

We cannot forbear to add our personal testimony to the intelligent, earnest, consistent, and practical policy of EPHRAIM STROCK for many years a steady patron of our publications, and frequent correspondent. Once, a few years ago, we enjoyed the privilege of a night's entertainment at his hospitable residence, and were greatly edified by his truly evangelical conversation. On all the living issues of the day he was perfectly at home, and had taken a decided stand for radical reform. He deeply deplored the decline of practical godliness and true piety, the departure of the Churches and Ministry in general from the living faith of their fathers, in neglecting to reprove popular and profitable sins, especially the enslavement of human beings. The Constitution of his country he interpreted in the light of its own Preamble and the Declaration of Independence. And consequently he saw no constitutional obstacle to a National deliverance of the oppressed, in accordance with the explicit requirements of God's word, which he held paramount to all human legislation and compacts. On these and other moral, religious, and political topics, his letters took the strongest ground, expressing his views with a strength, clearness, and compactness, well symbolized by his bold, exact, neat, and unequivocal hand-writing. He was a Christian and a patriot of the Old Revolutionary stamp, and one of the last of them that survived. May his mantle fall on all his descendants, and on the generation of their contemporaries. We could say nothing better for the cause of true religion, and of civil and religious freedom. A generation of such men would be a commencement of the Millennium. God speed the day.

MR. STROCK was a lineal descendant from "ELDER STROCK" one of the Puritan Pilgrim emigrants, arriving not long after the Mayflower. Sometime previous to his removal to Ohio, he resided in Monroe county, Western New York.

MR. CLINGMAN'S SPEECH.—We acknowledge the receipt, under frank of Hon. Thos. L. Clingman, of North Carolina, of his speech "against the revolutionary movements of the Anti-Slavery party," delivered in the Senate of the United States, January 16, 1860,* printed at the Congressional Globe office. We hope to find time and room for some further notice of it, in our columns.

News of the Day.

LEGISLATURE OF VIRGINIA.

A Joint Committee of both Houses of the Legislature, on "Harper's Ferry outrages," has elaborated an intensely radical pro-slavery document, occupying nearly six close printed columns of the *N. Y. Herald*, for Jan. 30, inclusive of a so-called "Non-Intercourse Bill," introduced into the Legislature by the Finance Committee. The Report of the Joint Committee closes with the following:

Your Committee, therefore, recommend to the General Assembly, the following resolutions:

1. Resolved, That the appropriate standing committee of the two houses of the General Assembly be instructed to prepare and report such bills as in their judgment may be necessary to organize, arm and equip the militia of the State for active and efficient service.

2. Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be instructed to prepare and report such bills as in their judgment may be most effectual (without violating the provisions of the Constitution of the United States) in encouraging the domestic manufactures of our own State, promoting direct trade with foreign countries, and establishing as far as may be practical, our commercial independence.

3. Resolved, That the committee for courts of justice be instructed to report such bills as may be necessary to secure the more prompt and effectual punishment of all foreign emissaries and others who may be found guilty of conspiring against the peace of our community or seeking to incite our slaves to insurrection.

The Bill from the Finance Committee, entitled "A Bill making regulations concerning special licenses," is quite elaborate.

orate and comply in its provisions. We are not quite certain that we fully comprehend the practical results expected to be reached by them. But we cannot understand how "without violating the provisions of the Constitution of the United States," Virginia can pass an Act of Non-Intercourse with Non-Slaveholding States, or with any portion of their citizens. But this is a matter for Virginians to look after. "Non-Inter-course" Acts seldom annoy anybody but their inventors. If Virginians can do without New York merchandise New Yorkers can do without their custom.

A SPEAKER ELECTED.—Mr. Pennington of New Jersey, (Republican) is elected Speaker of the House of Representatives by a majority of 120.

Thus have the pro-slavery Anti-democracy for the second time been defeated in the choice of Speaker, after a disorganizing struggle of two months. This should suffice them. And now that the House has a Speaker, the House and the country will not, probably, be bored by so much bunkum speaking.

DESTRUCTIVE FIRE.—On Sunday morning a fire broke out in the building, 48 Ann Street, occupied by Mr. Robert Bonner, proprietor of the New-York Ledger, and extended through to 133 Fulton Street. Mr. Bonner's loss is about \$50,000, insured for 20,000. A part of the building was occupied by Messrs. Wynkoop, Hallebeck & Thomas, steam job printers, who estimate their loss at \$80,000, insured for \$61,000. The proprietors of the *Mercury*, estimate their loss at \$5,500, of which \$1000 are insured. Other proprietors of publications printed at that office were sufferers, viz. of Bradstreet's Commercial Report, loss \$3,000, insured for \$1500, &c. Mr. Geo. Bruce, type founder, owned the building, loss \$15,000, insured for \$10,000. The fire extended to 46 Ann and 115 Fulton St., occupied by Messrs. Ward, Close & Co., wholesale druggists, loss \$35,000, fully insured. Some other buildings were injured, and contents damaged. Total loss estimated at \$175,000.

MEETING OF THE LOUISIANA LEGISLATURE.—THE GOVERNOR'S MESSAGE.—New Orleans, Jan. 19.—The Governor's message was transmitted to the Legislature of this State yesterday. The Governor recommends that the State be prepared to meet her sister States of the South in Convention, in case certain contingencies be complied with. He favors retaliating the hostility of the North by licensing and inflicting discriminations against Northern goods amounting to an absolute prohibition. The House passed a joint resolution declaring that the Harper's Ferry affair was an attack upon the rights and privileges of the South, and showing the hostility of the North. The Governor says he considers that the election of a Republican President is a cause for a dissolution of the Union.

THE ATTEMPT TO INTRODUCE SLAVERY INTO MINNESOTA.—The bill in the House, introduced by Mr. Sweet of Sauk Rapids, and supported so vehemently by Col. Robertson, of St. Paul, to insidiously permit slavery in Minnesota, was yesterday voted down by 57 to 12. Our reporter has not given the names of the 57 Democrats who voted for the atrocious proposition. We regret obtain them, however, and let our readers see hereafter. The 12 who are Democrats who sought to vote slavery into Minnesota. There is no doubt about two of them. George W. Sweet and Col. D. A. Robertson. Mark the enemies of liberty and humanity! *St. Paul Messenger, 5th Jan.*

COLORED PERSONS IN SOMERSET CO., MD.—The citizens of Quantico district, Somerset county, Md., at a recent public meeting adopted resolutions disapproving of the practice of hiring slaves to masters, with provision that the slaves first give their consent, protesting against allowing his slave to be used or employment of their own time. It was also resolved, That the constables of the district should arrest every colored person found in possession of firearms, and all white or colored persons of a suspicious character, who are to be compelled to give an account of themselves.—*Balt. Sun.*

THE WIFE OF GEORGE W. BROWN, editor of the *late Herald of Freedom*, has filed her petition with the Circuit Court of this county for a divorce, charging the said Brown with adultery on several occasions, since his office and on—in his own household, and with immoral treatment, such as to render her condition intolerable.—She has returned Judge Smith and S. N. Wood Esq., as her attorneys.

This George W. Brown is the creature whose slaves are against the pro-slavery press at the East. He is also the creature who, during his edit. career, published nearly every prominent Free-State man in Kansas.—*Lawrence Kans. Repub.*

THE PERSECUTION AT THE SOUTH.

From North Carolina we learn that there is no possibility of peacefulness without persecuting. Numbers of respectable citizens are arrested, for every suspicion, and are held in confinement. Among the poorer people, many are held in slavery, with the pretense of a summary trial. The only way to escape is to flee, and even the poor have been imprisoned and the property is confiscated. The friends of Mr. Worth claim that the prisoners are held in great numbers, and support a threatened trial in North Carolina.

Further persecutions will be met in several ways. Letter from a lady to an officer of the American Missionary Association.

GAITHERSBURY, N. Y., Jan. 18, 1860.

A present war of "religion" something like the Arabian (I read, when they started for the land of Promise, pursued by Pharaoh and his host, with the hot sun before them, and multitudes of their kind) would we hope to see the salvation of the land, resting on the arm of Jehovah (or position) I suppose, say, this you have seen some one of the Rev. Dr. Worth's arrest and commitment to prison in Greensboro, Guilford County, N. C., charged with circulating incendiary books, &c. principally the "Impending Crisis," by Holzer, which seems to have required more attention, at present, than all other books put together.

Brother Worth was arrested on the 23d of last month, had a preliminary trial before three magistrates on the 24th, which resulted in his commitment to prison to await further decision at the Spring Term of the Superior Court. There was great excitement at during his trial; three lawyers appeared in behalf of the State; the prisoner pleaded his own case in a noble manner—his enemies then lived by judgment. Since then, there have been five other arrests of citizens of this county (or circulating "Helter," most of them under heavy bonds, but all admitted to be completely unresolvable. The first was a bond of \$5,000 for his appearance at the Spring Term, which was complied with; the other was \$5,000 also, requiring him not to preach at all. This is not complied with yet. Not content with the above, he was arrested again, in prison, and brought out yesterday before Judge Dick, and bound in the sum of \$5,000 to appear at the Spring Term, in Randolph County, in March. His enemies seem determined to push the law to the furthest extremity, but the old veteran has been happy beyond description, and filled with joy unspeakable.

His keepers observe to him with vigilance, not allowing even his wife to speak a word to him without witnesses being present; or do they suffer him to write a word to any person, only what passes under their inspection. They made an attempt yesterday, during his trial, to deprive him of the means of writing at all, but finally conceded to let him have two or three sheets of paper at a time, by his giving an account to the Sheriff what disposition he made of it. One object seems to be to cut off all correspondence with friends, and indeed all the friends of liberty here must suffer likewise. They say that it is against the law to say slavery is wrong, and they have pronounced the word; the decree hangs over their heads all the while. I trust and believe there is a reward to who will trust and for God more than all who live in the land of intolerance and usurpation; and I hope that all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity will remember us at the Throne of Grace, that we may be able to withstand all the fiery darts of the wicked; also, that our aged ministry may be delivered from wicked and unreasonably men.

We feel deeply grateful for the interest manifested towards us by the American Missionary Association. May the blessing of the Most High attend your labors of love, be the prayer of your distant friend.

FROM KENTUCKY.

Rev. J. G. Fee, and some others, after being driven from Berea, Madison Co. Ky., went from Cincinnati to Bracken Co., on the Kentucky side of the Ohio River. This was the vicinity of Mr. Fee's birth place, and the scene of his early labors in the ministry. They hoped to be able to remain there, and prosecute their work without molestation. The following extracts from a letter of Mr. Fee to one of the Secretaries of the American Missionary Association, dated Germantown, Bracken Co., Jan. 25th, show that their hopes were not well founded:

"I am enduring a great trial. The Redeemer's name is again to be driven out by a mob, some being free, others in Madison County. Last Monday was supposed to have been a riot of about a thousand people at the County seat. With almost unanimous rush the mass gathered from the two counties, (I am near the Mason County

line) and resolved to drive me out. Some of the mob were armed with force. A Committee of one hundred men are appointed to come and watch to see if they would succeed in the destruction of my life. They are in human protection. I am in the house of one of the best men in the land, the State.

A few days since I was in a meeting at Hicksville, on a subject of freedom. I was surrounded by a mob of about twenty men, and I was in a great deal of trouble. Brother Hunsicker, a man of great courage, was with me.

We acted and talked for a while, and then I was in a meeting at Hicksville, on a subject of freedom. I was surrounded by a mob of about twenty men, and I was in a great deal of trouble. Brother Hunsicker, a man of great courage, was with me. We acted and talked for a while, and then I was in a meeting at Hicksville, on a subject of freedom. I was surrounded by a mob of about twenty men, and I was in a great deal of trouble. Brother Hunsicker, a man of great courage, was with me.

We acted and talked for a while, and then I was in a meeting at Hicksville, on a subject of freedom. I was surrounded by a mob of about twenty men, and I was in a great deal of trouble. Brother Hunsicker, a man of great courage, was with me. We acted and talked for a while, and then I was in a meeting at Hicksville, on a subject of freedom. I was surrounded by a mob of about twenty men, and I was in a great deal of trouble. Brother Hunsicker, a man of great courage, was with me.

Brothers Hanson, Griffin, Mallett, Holman, and Robinson, are ordered to leave here. Brother Davis (Rev. J. S. Davis of Cahin Creek, Lewis Co.) is also driven out. A tremendous meeting for that purpose, preceded the one held here."

The following corroborates the preceding letter of Mr. Fee, and records the consummation of the event.

Expulsion of Citizens from Kentucky.

CINCINNATI, Tuesday, Jan. 31. Eighteen citizens of Mason and Bracken Counties, Kentucky, have been expelled from the State, on account of their opinions on slavery. Most of them arrived here yesterday.

SECURITY AGAINST COUNTERFEITS.

W. L. Ormsby, in the N. Y. Times, replies to Mercator. In the same paper, in opposition to his project of uniform plates for all the banks. He says

"Now, instead of gaining security this would actually increase counterfeiting precisely 21 times.

"This is as old as the patch-work and die system itself. Perkins' stereotyped plates" were made on this plan. All the Banks in the New England States were at one time obliged by law to use them. But when one counterfeit was successfully made on the bank it was virtually a counterfeit on all. That was a system simple and sure precisely to produce the extent of circulation and number of Banks using the system, was also proved by the very State of New York when the general Banking law first went into operation. The law authorized the Superintendent of the Bank Department to get all plates preserved in the best manner to prevent counterfeiting. On applying to bank note engravers for a "best manner," he knew nothing anything about himself, he was induced to adopt one uniform plan throughout the State—that is, all the one dollar denominations for

All banks were alike, and so were the counterfeiters. The only variation from the law, I understand, in counterfeiting such one bank notes, was a half a cent, which was the case for which were already in circulation. It was not a very long time before the law was repealed, and the counterfeiters were free to make as many as they pleased. It was not a very long time before the law was repealed, and the counterfeiters were free to make as many as they pleased. It was not a very long time before the law was repealed, and the counterfeiters were free to make as many as they pleased.

N. B. The following is a list of the names of the counterfeiters of the one dollar notes, as given by the Superintendent of the Bank Department, New York, in 1858. The names are given in alphabetical order, and the number of the counterfeiters is given in parentheses. The names are given in alphabetical order, and the number of the counterfeiters is given in parentheses.

Mr. Ormsby would seek security, in the opposite direction. He would require each bank to procure "one whole picture, original in design and engraving."

Another writer in the Times, "Experience," says it is a mistake that there are not numerous counterfeiters of the Bank of England. He also expresses the opinion that coins are as easily counterfeited as paper notes, and suggests that too little has been done to detect and punish the perpetrators of counterfeits.

THE ABOLITIONISTS IN NORTH CAROLINA.—We learn that Judge Dick is indefatigable in his efforts to bring the vendors and circulators of Helper's book to justice. He issued his warrant to the sheriff of Guilford, directing him to make a search in Randolph, and much additional evidence was obtained against Daniel Worth. The judge had him brought out of jail, examined him, and required him to give bail in \$5,000 to answer at the next term of Randolph Superior Court for incendiary preaching, and for circulating incendiary documents in that county. Worth was remanded to jail in default of security.

Among other things it was proved that at a meeting held by Worth last summer, in Randolph, some white females had taken some chairs in front of his pulpit, and there were some negro women seated on benches in the rear of the pulpit. Before he began to preach, he ordered the white women to give up their chairs to the "black sisters," which was accordingly done.

We learn that Judge Dick has ordered the commanding officer to detail a guard for the Greensboro jail, so as to cut off all possibility of Worth's escape.

We learn further, that the proclamation taken with Worth, Wheeler, Harris, Turner and Vester, has struck terror to the abolition incursions in that quarter.—Randolph Standard.

Special Dispatch to the New-York Times.

WASHINGTON, Wednesday, Feb. 1.

The election of a Speaker to-day, was not attended by particular excitement, as it was known to be a foregone conclusion, and the excitement too, had in a measure exhausted itself by its previous intensity. Previous to the announcement of the vote, Mr. Keit attempted to distract the Republicans, by announcing as a fact, that Mr. Pennington was in favor of the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law, and had recommended it in a message, while Governor of New Jersey, which happened to be ten years prior to the passage of the law. The only effect of this announcement, was to irritate those who had voted for Mr. Pennington, of his conservative and national sentiments, and thus justify the vote.

President Lord of Dartmouth College has been writing another letter in favor of Slavery. He says that New England will be compelled to introduce Slavery. The children grand-children of the present Abolitionists, he says, may be the first to introduce a "harder servitude than is yet known, and, in fact, they should themselves be compelled to sell themselves for bond, and suffer the proper chastisement of their fathers as they rebel against the government of God." The editor of the *Independent Democrat* of New York, a graduate of Dartmouth, says that Dr. Lord is insane, and has been ten years.

Some of the most interesting papers, are reproducing a touching story of a neglected daughter of Mrs. Lydia Maria Child. The story is given by Mr. Child, his wife, and a daughter's son. She wrote the "Mother's Book," but never was a mother; is the author of "The Family Nurse," but never had a family.

The Hon. ROBERT J. McSPRUE, of the 5th inst., gives a statement of the fruits of that city, showing the amount of sales (in detail) in the various branches of business, for the year 1890, together with the number of houses erected and their expense of construction, for the same period. The total amount of sales was \$2,075,500 00. No. of buildings erected, 249. Expense of constructing buildings, \$346,700 00.

The items of business connected together with the bank stock paid in, amount of their investments and buildings erected, make a total sum of \$3,188,390.

Family Miscellany.

For the Principal.

"MEET AGAIN!"

"Meet again!" ah, shall we meet?
These few days have been most sweet,—
Beautiful, but passing fleet!

"Meet again!" ah me, how dreary,
Sad my life would be, and weary,
Might I never more be near thee!

Thou whose smiles have then gathered
All my life's lost rays, and scattered
Round me gleams of joy unmeasured:

Must the night come, cold and cheerless,
All its gloom I could meet, fearless;
But its solitude—not tearless.

Thou my day art, night thy loveliness,
All Earth's smiles and glittering dross
Without thee, were but golden cross.

Yet God keep thee, dearest one,
Not all for my poor sake alone;
But better, dearest far,—thine own.

Blessings go with thee, ever, ever,
Meet we soon, or meet we never,
Thou shalt be beloved forever.

Fare thee well! x.

For "The Principals."

"THE ROYAL TRAIN."

The following lines were written in reference to the decease of the late DEB. JAMES WARNER, of Brooklyn, N. Y., and relate, almost verbatim, some of his utterances, a short time previous to his departure.

With lifted hand, and upward eye—
"Thy coming!" said he—soon to die!

"What's coming?" said he—he made reply,
"The royal train!"—"thy coming high!"

"I see it not."—"Oh no! In vain
You look—but I can plainly see:
For me it comes, the royal train,
It comes; and ready I must be."

"Thy coming."—Yes. In state sublime,
From glorious heights 'twas wending down
Between Eternity and Time,
Rich laden with the Cross, the Crown.

It came, it passed and with its light,
Far from the abodes of woe and sin,
To mansions of eternal light
The royal train had borne him in.

For The Principals.

A TRUE STORY.

A young minister, whose labors of love have been greatly blessed to the lambs of his flock, relates the following interesting incident:

It is his custom to assemble these little ones for an hour's service every week. His manner of conducting the exercises is at once so simple and appropriate that we wish it might be adopted by every church and pastor. After the opening prayer, a child repeats a Bible verse, a second leads in prayer, a third repeats a Bible verse, and so on until every one has taken part in the meeting. This is a graceful and

persuaded with the singing of hymns and relations of religious experience.

It was on one of these interesting occasions that a little girl remarked that she knew that the Lord heard her prayers. "How do you know?" inquired her pastor, surprised at the child's confidence.

"Because," she replied, "a few days ago my school teacher required me to write a composition. I had never done such a thing in my life, and I did not think it possible. I could not think of anything to write about. To avoid not disobeying my teacher. Remembering that Mr. J. had said, if we ask God for anything in faith, he will not deny us, I went into my closet, and there begged my Heavenly Father to aid me in my new duty.

"A subject came into my mind, and as I took my pen, words flowed faster than I could write them." "So," said she simply, "I have learned by experience that the prayer of faith is sure to be answered."

RED PARSONAGE.

For the Principals.

"THE MOTHER'S FAITH."

A FACT.

"I should like to know what Mother thinks of the Lord, now!" exclaimed a little boy of ten years, as a group of half-starved brothers and sisters were preparing for school, without a breakfast, one bitter cold morning.

Well knew each member of that hungry band of little ones, that through all the trying scenes of poverty, in their father's long illness, a firm and unwavering faith had upheld their praying mother. But now when the last fire had been made, and the last frugal meal of baked potatoes eaten, and her own frail form was sinking beneath its burden of work and sorrow, the climax seemed reached. "What does mother think of the Lord, now?" fell upon the ears of one of the loveliest women I ever met. It was from the lips of her first-born, her darling, for whose submission to God she had ever been hoping and striving. The words fell upon her heart, like lead. It was a new test of her sorely tried faith, a new drop added to her bitter cup.

A long and severe sickness of her husband had reduced them to extreme poverty, and with no resource but the needle, it had been difficult to meet the demands of a large family, and perform sick room duties at the same time. When this eventful morning dawned, there was no more food in the house, and just wood enough to build one more fire. A slice of borrowed bread was toasted for the sick man, and his pillow chafed drawn before the last fire. He knew not the destination, the toil, the self-sacrifice that oppressed his wife, he saw only the smiles, the industry, the neatness, and the patient waiting for brighter days.

When the darling words of the hungry boy fell upon that christian mother's ear, she just lifted up her heart, in the silent eloquence and fervor of ejaculatory prayer, known only to the toll-worn and working deity. The answer came—"The Lord is good, his mercy endureth forever!" Her heart responded, and as she raised her eyes to the window, two good loads of wood standing there testified that she had not thought too much of her Heavenly Father, or trusted in his promises too long. The sun shone again upon that household, and never more did Henry say, "If wonder what mother thinks of the Lord, now!"

RED PARSONAGE.

No. Three.

OLD TIMES AND NEW.

"THE CONTINENTAL OLD FOLKS."

MR. GULICK'S CHOIR of singers, adorned in antique costume, gave a concert on Monday evening of last week at the Odeon, in Williamsburg, for the benefit of the Industrial School on North Second Street. The object was a worthy one, the entertainment promised to be—as it proved to be—an attractive and interesting one. The house was crowded, the audience, myself and family included, well pleased, and everything "came off" as happily as could be desired. The choir had taken great pains to prepare themselves, in the matter of singing as of dress, and a Choir of better singers, or led by a better Chorister, we could not reasonably desire. And yet, as the effort was to personate the Choir of "Old Continental," Revolutionary, or Colonial times, we may indulge the privilege of an old man, whose father and grandfather were "Old Continentals," to criticize the performance at some points, and explain it at some others, lest the rising generation should be misled in respect to the music and dresses of their ancestors.

The *general appearance* of the choir, both ladies and gentlemen should be attributed, in part, to the ludicrously and janglingly together, in one group, of the *serious* successful fashions extant during a period of seventy years, the dresses of fifty years ago, with those (as was stated) of one hundred and twenty years ago, with some of the intermediate fashions between them. As for example, the "gun-bout bonnet" of young ladies in Mr. Jefferson's time, say 1806 in honor of his favorite armament, which we well remember, was here, paraded by the side of the three cornered cocked hats of their grandfathers, which had disappeared from the class of youthful fashion a full generation previous which it was not our privilege to witness. An other element of the *ludicrous* was the putting off the heads of some of the young ladies, the bonnets which were *never* made for nor used by young ladies, but only for and by their maternally mothers, or grandmothers, as the heavy structures and sombre hues here witnessed. For the old ladies of former times, were not cautious to dress, and appear like young ladies, as many old ladies now do. Our modern dresses might be made to appear equally ludicrous, by jumbling together, in one group, the various fashions that have appeared within the last twenty years, the dresses of the old and the young, and of all them put on by the young. The best moral of this exhibition of dresses, was the absurdity and bad taste of many of the ever fluctuating fashions, and type and modern. We could not help remarking, by the bye, the absence from this exhibition, of the long bodices and the small round hoops of our Colonial grandmothers and "Continental" grandmothers. The young ladies in the audience were not shown how, after a cycle of eighty or a hundred years, the cost off and long ridiculed fashions of their grand and great grandmothers had recently come into use again! The ludicrous effect was further intensified, by putting the very largest and heaviest bonnets, which had doubtless been made for the largest and tallest elderly ladies, upon the heads of small, and comparatively short young ladies, producing appearances never witnessed when the bonnets were first worn.

And so of the music. We expected to hear a specimen of the *palms* of the "Continental old folks" of the Revolutionary period, or of the previous Colonial times; such as Old Hundred, Wudoor, Near, Wells, Windham, Aylebure, and the like; for this, incontestably, was the exclusive style of the Sabbath music of those times, a style which, after the prevalence of successive different styles, has, of later years, been in a degree revived and restored. Instead of this, we recognized not a single psalm tune, not a single piece of music, with the exception, perhaps, of Old Denmark, which, in the times of the Old "Continental" Congress, and previously, we could suppose to have been heard. Among the oldest of the tunes sung, and a noble one of the class, was "Majesty," common metre, which, though dismissed from the choirs before 1805 or 6, did not belong to the old Colonial times. The lively, rapid, fugue tunes, were an abomination to the venerable remnant of the cocked hat generation, when first introduced, and many of the "Continental Old Folks" were wont to put on their cocked hats, and walk out, when the chorister named them.

The venerable Dr. EMMONS who was one of the last survivors of the "Continental" generation, could never endure them, to the day of his death, nor the tenor and bass viol that came into use with them, and which figured so conspicuously in the performance of the modern "Continental Old Folks," at the Odeon. In the published volumes of Emmons, may be found one or more sermons on sacred music, in which the old, grave, solemn choral style of psalmody is commended the "new-fangled" lively, fugue style, with its "swells" deprecated, and the reasons assigned, in connection with criticisms well deserving the attention of Choristers, Teachers, Singers, and Composers of music, at all times. All the "Old Continentals" however, were not as rigid as Dr. Emmons. In respect to the use of musical instruments. We remember how good old Deacon Grow, (the grandfather of Hon. Galusha A. Grow, now in Congress, remonstrated with some of his brethren and sisters in the Church, for their leaving the meeting, on account of the bass viol. "Come to meeting," said he, "in a devotional frame of mind, and the fiddle will not disturb you. It will be to you like David's Harp, of solemn sound." In time, the opposition relaxed. The "Old Continentals" were appeased by the occasional singing of Near, Wells, or Old Hundred,

